

### REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Final Office Action dated September 8, 2006. Claims 1-46 are pending and stand rejected. Applicant has amended claim 26. Applicant submits that no new matter was added by the amendments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

#### Section 102 Rejections

Claims 26, 27, 29, 30, 42, 43, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,781,909, issued to *Logan et al.* ("*Logan*"). Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over *Logan*.

Claim 26 recites receiving a rotation set comprising a list identifying pages to be displayed in a predetermined sequence and displaying each page, where the pages are retrieved from a cache and displayed in the predetermined sequence repeatedly until a new rotation set is received. Instead, *Logan* teaches receiving a URL request and searching the transition control list to determine if the received URL request contains a URL which matches a trailing URL on the list, and if so, first displaying the page identified by the URL in the leading field (*Logan*, column 26-31). *Logan* also teaches inserting a sequence of leading pages prior to the trailing page identified in the original link (*Logan*, column 10, lines 1-3). Furthermore, *Logan* teaches, when a leading URL is not specified, displaying a page from a collection of available pages randomly or by cycling through a list of insertable display page URLs (*Logan*, column 9, lines 50-52). *Logan* does not teach receiving a rotation set comprising a list of identifying pages to be displayed in a predetermined sequence and displaying each page, where pages are retrieved from a cache and displayed in a predetermined sequence repeatedly until a new rotation set is received. Accordingly, claim 26 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Independent claim 42 recites limitations that are similar, although not identical, to the limitations of claim 26 discussed above. Accordingly, for reasons stated above in connection with claim 26, claim 42 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

### Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 16, 17, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0046299 filed by *Lefeber et al.* ("*Lefeber*") in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0016839 filed by *Smith et al.* ("*Smith*").

Claim 1 recites receiving a request for a page containing the changed data in response to the notification. Instead, *Lefeber* teaches that sending the alert to a device is synchronized with a concurrent instruction to a webserver that any requests for a user-specified URL are to be automatically redirected to a webpage crafted by the network (*Lefeber*, paragraph 0066). *Lefeber* does not teach receiving a request for a page containing changed data in response to a notification. Furthermore, *Smith* does not teach receiving a request for a page containing changed data in response to a notification, nor does the Office Action include a citation to any portion of the reference that is asserted to teach such limitations. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 2-11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Smith* in further view of *Logan*. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber*, *Smith* and *Logan* in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0039776 filed by *Ballard* ("*Ballard*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,985,950 issued to *Hanson et al.* ("*Hanson*"). Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber*, *Smith*, and *Logan* in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0078134 filed by *Stone et al.* ("*Stone*"). Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Smith*, in further view of *Ballard* and *Hanson*. Claims 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Smith et al.* in further view of *Ballard*. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Smith* in further view of *Ballard* and *Logan*.

For the reasons stated above in connection with independent claim 1, the claims are allowable over *Lefeber*. The Office Action fails to cite any teaching or suggestion in the additional cited references of the missing elements discussed above. Therefore, claims 2-15, 18, 19, 21 and 23 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above in conjunction with claims 1.

Claims 28 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan* in further view of *Stone*. For the reasons stated above in connection with independent claims 26 and 42, the claims are allowable over *Logan*. The Office Action fails to cite any teaching or suggestion in *Stone* of the missing elements discussed above. Accordingly, claims 28 and 46 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above in conjunction with claims 26 and 42.

Claims 31, 32 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,311,187 issued to *Jeyarman et al.* ("*Jeyarman*"). Claims 33, 34, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Jeyarman* in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0084124 filed by *Su et al.* ("*Su*") and *Logan*. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Jeyarman* in further review of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0005129 filed by *Scheinkman* ("*Sheinkman*"). Claims 38 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Jeyarman* in further view of *SearchSecurity.com* ("*SearchSecurity*"). Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Jeyarman* in further view of *Ballard*.

Independent claim 31 recites limitations that are similar, although not identical, to the limitations of claim 1 discussed above. For at least the reasons stated above in connection with independent claim 1, claim 31 and its dependent claims are allowable over *Lebefer*. The Office Action fails to cite any teaching or suggestion in the additional cited references of the missing elements discussed above. Accordingly, claims 31-41 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above in conjunction with claims 1.

### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant believes no fees are due with this submission. If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 05-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 8, 2006

/Elizabeth Philip Dahm/

Elizabeth Philip Dahm  
Reg. No. 51,352

**PTO Customer No. 26230**

Fish & Richardson P.C.

1717 Main Street

Suite 5000

Dallas, Texas 75201

Telephone: (214) 760-6119

Facsimile: (214) 747-2091